

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529 - 2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[REDACTED]

41

Date: **NOV 19 2012**

Office: HOUSTON

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. If your appeal was dismissed or rejected, all documents have been returned to the National Benefits Center. You no longer have a case pending before this office, and you are not entitled to file a motion to reopen or reconsider your case. If your appeal was sustained or remanded for further action, you will be contacted.


Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The director of the Houston office terminated the temporary resident status of the applicant, pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, finding the applicant to be ineligible for temporary resident status based upon both a lack of documentation and inconsistent documentation in the record of proceedings. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that the interviewing officer denied him the right to have an interpreter present at his interview. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.¹

The temporary resident status of an alien may be terminated upon the determination that the alien was ineligible for temporary residence. Section 245A(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(b)(2)(A), and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(u)(i).

An applicant for temporary resident status must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the date the application is filed. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2). The applicant must also establish that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States since November 6, 1986. Section 245A(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(3). The regulations clarify that the applicant must have been physically present in the United States from November 6, 1986 until the date of filing the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

The applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. The inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5).

Although the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provides an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit in support of his or her claim of continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since prior to January 1, 1982, the submission of any other relevant document is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's own testimony, and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

The "preponderance of the evidence" standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant's claim is "probably true," where the determination of "truth" is made based on the factual circumstances of each individual case. *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989). In evaluating the evidence, *Matter of E-M-* also stated that "[t]ruth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality." *Id.* Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine each piece of evidence for

¹ The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true. See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). The weight to be given any affidavit depends on the totality of the circumstances, and a number of factors must be considered. More weight will be given to an affidavit in which the affiant indicates personal knowledge of the applicant's whereabouts during the time period in question rather than a fill-in-the-blank affidavit that provides generic information. The regulations provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment or attestations by churches or other organizations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.2(d)(3)(i) and (v).

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the applicant submits relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads the director to believe that the claim is "probably true" or "more likely than not," the applicant or petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. See *U.S. v. Cardozo-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421 (1987) (defining "more likely than not" as a greater than 50 percent probability of something occurring). If the director can articulate a material doubt, it is appropriate for the director to either request additional evidence or, if that doubt leads the director to believe that the claim is probably not true, deny the application or petition. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I & N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established his eligibility for temporary resident status. As stated, the applicant must establish that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of an employer letter, paystubs, a Form W-2 and a wage report from the Social Security Administration. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after May 4, 1988; however, because evidence of residence after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, it shall not be discussed.

The applicant has submitted an employment verification letter from [REDACTED], formerly of [REDACTED] Services. Mr. [REDACTED] indicates that he worked for [REDACTED] Services for approximately five years as shop foreman in the mid-1970s, during which time the applicant worked for him.

The employment verification letter of [REDACTED] does not meet the requirements set forth in the regulations, which provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) provides that letters from employers must include: (A) Alien's address at the time of employment; (B) Exact period of employment; (C) Periods of layoff; (D) Duties with the company; (E) Whether or not the information was taken from official company records; and (F) Where records are located and whether the Service may have access to the records. If the records are unavailable, an affidavit-form letter stating that the alien's employment records are unavailable and why such records are unavailable may be accepted in lieu of subsections (E) and (F). The employment verification letter fails to comply with the above cited regulation because it lacks considerable detail regarding the applicant's employment. For instance, the witness does not state the applicant's daily work duties, or the number of hours or days he was employed. Furthermore, the witness does not state how he was able to date the

applicant's employment. It is unclear whether he referred to his own recollection or any records he may have maintained. For these additional reasons, the employment verification letter is of little probative value.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of a Social Security Administration wage report showing that the applicant earned wages in the years 1976 through 1982, 1984 through 1986 and again in 1989. He also submitted a copy of two pay stubs dated in 1985 and 1986 and a copy of a Form W-2 dated in 1984. This is evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States for some, but not all, of the requisite period.

The director noted inconsistencies in the addresses listed on the applicant's two Form I-687s. The AAO finds that the inconsistencies are not significant in this case.

The AAO finds that the applicant has failed to provide sufficient probative and credible evidence of his continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

The record also reveals that the applicant has two misdemeanor convictions.² Two misdemeanor convictions do not render the applicant ineligible for temporary resident status.

The applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he continuously resided in the United States throughout the entire requisite period as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E- M-*, *supra*. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act on this basis. As the applicant has not overcome the basis for the termination of status, the appeal must be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.

² January 11, 1982 [REDACTED] and December 29, 1981 [REDACTED]